EXHIBIT 4

## Jon-Jamison Hill (LA)

From: Mitra Ahouraian Esq <mitra@ahouraianlaw.com>

**Sent:** Monday, July 14, 2025 1:34 PM **To:** Sanford L. Michelman (LA)

**Cc:** Jon-Jamison Hill (LA); Manuel Deran (LA)

**Subject:** Re: Isabella Ferrer Indemnity - JAMS Neutral Analysis

**Categories:** Filed to ND

FilingIndicator: -1

## **CAUTION:** Email from external account

Following up on the attached and below. Also, my colleagues have emailed you twice to confirm that you will accept service on behalf of your client. I'd appreciate a confirmation by the end of day.

Thank you.

Reserving all rights.



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

On Tue, Jun 24, 2025 at 3:33 PM Mitra Ahouraian Esq <<u>mitra@ahouraianlaw.com</u>> wrote: Gentlemen:

Sorry for the delay. JAMS was revising the engaging agreement (at my request) to reflect the fact that Wayfarer will be paying costs, and I just received it today. Please see attached.

As far as the language of the agreement between the parties, we are aligned in our understanding of the agreement, i.e. if an invoice is not approved by Judge Carpinello, Wayfarer is not obligated to pay it. JAMS felt the language was not sufficient in terms of instructing Judge Carpinello and giving him the

authority to approve in-part and reject in-part according to his judgement. I think putting that in an email with instructions from both parties should suffice. Please confirm.

Thank you.



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 11:51 AM Sanford L. Michelman (LA) < SMichelman@mrllp.com > wrote:

Isn't this already in the agreement?

From: Mitra Ahouraian Esq <mitra@ahouraianlaw.com>

Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 2:35 PM

To: Sanford L. Michelman (LA) <SMichelman@mrllp.com>

Cc: Jon-Jamison Hill (LA) < <a href="mailto:line">jhill@mrllp.com</a>; Manuel Deran (LA) < <a href="mailto:mderan@mrllp.com">mderan@mrllp.com</a>>

Subject: Re: Isabella Ferrer Indemnity - JAMS Neutral Analysis

**CAUTION:** Email from external account

So the agreement says that Judge Carpinello has to approve the invoices, but they want to know what happens if he doesn't approve an invoice as-is. We don't want a scenario where he is either approving, or he's not - we ultimately want it resolved so the invoice is closed out, so if he makes a determination, for example, that X isn't reasonable or related but Y is, that will be his determination (not just yes or no). I assume this is our understanding given how a court/arbitrator would determine fees, but they want clarity.